DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 620 UD 021 035

AUTHOR Ghory, Ward J.
TITLE Model Building in Urban Education: The Cincinnati Urban Education Pilot Project.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 28p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement: *Administrator Role: Community Involvement: *Educational Improvement: Full State Funding: High Schools: Inner City: *Models: Principals: Resource Allocation: Staff Development: Student Behavior: Student Motivation: *Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS *Ohio (Cincinnati): *Urban Education Pilot Project OH

ABSTRACT

This paper concerns the process of developing model urban education programs and is based on the experiences of the state funded Urban Education Pilot Project (UEPP) being carried out in one Cincinnati, Ohio, inner city public high school attendance area. First, key premises used by the UEPP are outlined. These include: (1) principals are the major decision makers for the use of project resources across the district, while central office project staff serve as coordinators and resource people who carry out the principals' decisions: (2) improvement in a high school district comes both from within each school and from coordinated project-wide activities: (3) urban schools can improve if a comprehensive approach is made in the areas of student achievement, student motivation, student conduct, staff development, and community involvement: and (4) model urban programs should be developed and tested in those classrooms they are meant to influence. Progress to date in the areas named above (student achievement, motivation and conduct, staff development, and community involvement) is then discussed and is described as excellent. Finally, five case examples from the model (the Council of Principals, the Honor Clubs, the Extended Day program, Talent Search, and the University Collaboration program) are analyzed in terms of their potential for contributing to successful model building programs. (Author/GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

OCT 1 3 1980

ED195620

MODEL BUILDING IN URBAN EDUCATION:

THE CINCINNATI URBAN EDUCATION PILOT PROJECT

Dr. Ward J. Ghory

Cincinnati Public Schools

A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Boston in April, 1980.

CE021035

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ward J. Ghory

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

In 1977, over the Governor's veto, the Ohio State Legislature passed a bill allocating $4 million to develop a model educational district in one inner-city public high school feeder system. In November, 1977, after initially being denied permission to apply for this program by the Cincinnati Board of Education, the seventeen schools of the Hughes High School feeder system were awarded $2 million for the biennium 1977-79 to develop "a model for urban education."

What did the legislators have in mind when they allocated millions of dollars to develop an educational "model"? The judiciously ambiguous language of Amemded Substitute Bill No. 59 stressed two priorities. The first charge was to identify effective preventive, rehabilitative, and developmental educational programs. The second mandate was to coordinate all the special and general funded programs in one feeder system into a clearly articulated sequence of learning opportunities for the students progressing from grades one through twelve. The educational "model", then, was to consist of successfully tested program elements which were coordinated district-wide for optimum impact. The overall intention of the urban pilot project legislation was to establish educational models in one city, so they could then be replicated in other urban centers in the state.

This paper focuses on the process of developing model urban education programs. First, four key premises now used by the Cincinnati Urban Education Pilot Project (UEPP) to develop its programs are advanced. Second, interim results after two years of operation are presented. Third, five brief case studies of model program development are analyzed.

PREMISES FOR DEVELOPING MODEL PROGRAMS

In the beginning, the dubious long-term success of federally funded demonstration projects led UEPP to re-consider the concept of a "model program." The development of model programs had generally been considered a "theoretic" activity.[1] Theoretic model builders perceived problems as generalized concepts common to many situations and relatively independent of the practitioners enmeshed in those situations.[2] For example, the problem of determining optimum class size for third graders in ghetto schools could be treated without regard for the unique needs of a teacher or a particular school. If the problems endemic to urban schools were seen as general ones, then the solutions sought would also be universal ones. Thus, a model program effective in one situation was viewed as being based on omnipresent variables inter-related in a lawful way. If the same variables could be combined in the same fashion in another related situation, the true model program would again produce a similar desired outcome.[3]

Unfortunately, demonstration programs built on these assumptions have not led to the long-term adoptions of innovations by the participating districts. To determine why so few model programs persisted behind classroom doors once funding was discontinued, the U.S. Office of Education contracted the Rand Corporation to study a national sample of 293 federally-funded projects drawn from eighteen states. Their evaluation revealed inconsistent and generally disappointing results. Despite considerable innovative activity on the part of local school districts, the evidence suggested that:

1) No class of educational treatments has been found that consistently leads to improved student outcomes (when variations in the institutional setting and nonschool factors are taken into account).

2) "Successful" projects have difficulty sustaining their success over a number of years.

3) "Successful" projects are not disseminated automatically or easily, and their "replication" in new sites usually falls short of their performance in the original sites.[4]

In sum, the net return to the federal investment had been the creation of many demonstration programs, the successful implementation of a few, and the long-run continuation (after funding ceased) of still fewer.

Clearly, to be effective, UEPP would have to base its model-building activities on a different set of assumptions and premises. The Rand Study suggested that the way an innovative project was implemented spelled the difference between long-term success and failure, almost independently of the type of innovation or educational method involved.[5] In other words, the key to successful adoption of a model program was to develop an effective ongoing model-building process. Effective implementation strategies promoted mutual adaptation, a process by which the model program was adapted to the reality of its institutional setting, while at the same time teachers and school officials adapted their practices in response to the model. An emphasis on mutual adaptation of an innovative idea shifted the perspective away from indentifying and replicating the "one best way", toward solving practical problems in a particular setting using the ideas and energies of participants, as well as the materials and processes provided by an innovative project.

In Schwab's terms, the shift in perspective necessary to promote long-term adoption of innovations was from the theoretic to the practical.[6] Change agents working from a practical perspective ceased the search for

global explanations and comprehensive patterns, and concerned themselves with the resolution of specific problems. Problems were not viewed as deep-seated difficulties familiar from many urban settings, but rather as particular concrete situations acknowledged as perplexing or concerning by those who participated in them. Given this view, situations could not be treated en masse with one or more model programs. Rather, the unique qualities of situations and their participants had to be taken into account before effective action could begin. The improvement of school environments through the development of model programs was thus viewed as a social process involving changes in the way participants behaved and thought, not as a clinical process in which the lives of students were influenced by the operation of scientific or educational laws.

Of course, theories about how educational outcomes could be produced were not ignored. Nor were the lessons of successful demonstration projects downplayed. Instead, in an eclectic way, theories and model programs were used in three ways. First, they were applied intact to situational needs when possible. Second, they were adapted to fit situations as much as was necessary. Third, new theories or model programs were generated and pilot-tested, in the absence of theoretical knowledge relevant to the situation. In short, UEPP adopted a flexible, practical-oriented approach to model building. The project viewed the charge to "develop an educational model" as a mandate to create problem-solving processes that would lead to ongoing improvement in the specific contexts of our district.

Over the years, four key operating premises have been developed by a trial and error process. These four premises are now used to guide our practice.

Premise 1. The principals are the key decision-makers for the use of project resources across the district. Central Office project staff serve as coordinators and resource people who carry out principals' decisions.

Most special funded projects must retain tight, centralized control, because the purpose for their funding is narrow and the results they are expected to produce are quite specific. In general, principals and teachers must accept this control structure if they desire the supplemental funds for their school. But the special funds and outside control often lead to the creation of a segregated program within a school. Along its narrow band of attention, the special project may be quite successful, but the ongoing school programs functioning to either side of the demonstration program are unaffected. In short, the demonstration program affects only a limited population and influences only a portion of the school environment, in part because its control structure tends to isolate the innovation from the mainstream programs.

UEPP's first operating premise turned decision-making authority over to a Council of Principals, bringing together all project principals on a monthly basis to make budget decisions, set goals and objectives, approve implementation policies, and monitor program accomplishments. A small Central Office management staff was created to carry out the principals' decisions. The management group had no voting power on the Council. With principals as decision-makers, no distinction was made between general fund programs and UEPP programs. All the ongoing operations of a school were eligible for support by UEPP, since the intention of the project was to influence the total educational environment in the school.

Premise 2. Improvement in a high school district comes from two directions: from within each school, and from coordinated activities on a project-wide basis.

It was not initially self-evident to most principals that what was done in a neighboring school could contribute directly to improvement efforts at their schools. Instead, lacking adequate resources, the urban principal had become conditioned to manipulating the system to acquire the greatest number of resources to guarantee survival and continuation of current programs at his or her school. This conditioning led to common acceptance of the assumption that improvement came mainly from within the school.

The premise that improvement in school comes both from within and from without the school rested on two additional assumptions. First, principals recognized that they acted in a decision-making context consisting partly of system-wide policies and procedures governing local school operation. Often, the policies were viewed as restrictive. In these terms, principals accepted that one form improvement from without could take would be the opportunity to create new policies for administrative operations at least in one district.

Second, principals recognized that each school had an influence on children for only a portion of their educational career. When educational patterns across a high school feeder system were looked at in terms of the experience of children who must progress from grade 1 to grade 12, the coordination of programs across grade levels and among schools made sense. Secondary principals, for example, were acutely aware that their fortunes for the first weeks of school each fall depended on the preparation students had already received. Elementary principals in urban areas, who must cope

with mobility rates exceeding 60% each year in some UEPP schools, also realized that environmental continuities across schools would make the transition to a new school much easier for incoming students. For these reasons, UEPP principals decided to commit their budget to improvement efforts from two directions, within the school and across project schools. Surprisingly, the percent of project funds that goes directly to school programs specific to one school only has decreased from 80% in 1977-78, to 44% in 1978-79, to 43% in 1979-80, to 35% in 1980-81. This startling willingness of urban principals to relinquish funds they control for programs at their own schools to support activities that benefit not only their school but all project schools is evidence that a change of perspective about school improvement is occurring.

Premise 3. Urban schools can improve if a comprehensive approach is made on five key fronts: student achievement, student motivation, student conduct, staff development and community involvement.

When significant improvement was sought across an entire high school feeder system, a comprehensive effort aimed at creating a different orientation and values among participants was seen as necessary. UEPP sought to stimulate a transformed educational climate in fifteen schools,[7] a climate characterized by successful achievement, high student motivation to learn well, positive student conduct, ongoing staff development and active community involvement. We expected this change to occur in small, incremental steps, with necessary adjustments of direction as new issues and concerns emerged. We committed ourselves to gradual, broad-based change, not to the kind of showy results that could be produced by directing $1 million at a narrow target. In short, our premise was that the magnitude

of the problems in our district required a comprehensive, not a targetted, approach.

Premise 4. Model urban programs are developed and tested by practitioners in one related set of schools, instead of being imported from outside and imposed through mandatory inservice programs.

Just as most decisions about the curriculum of a school have been made at levels far removed from the teacher and learner, so have most model programs been developed and perfected away from the classrooms they are designed to influence. Those who are supposed to adopt the innovation are introduced to a program already well-constructed, and denied the opportunity to define problems or develop program strategies. UEPP attempts to revise this typical process, by providing the opportunity for teachers and principals to propose innovative programs of their own for supplemental UEPP funds. Each year UEPP solicits from the schools proposals related to the five UEPP goals. The Council of Principals sets funding allocations for each school and approves the school-based programs sought by each principal.

Several additional steps can be taken to capitalize on the valuable ideas each school may contribute. If a school project is found to be successful at one school, the program idea is made available for adaptation and implementation by other interested UEPP schools. In this way, communication among teachers and principals across urban school environments leads to a growing consensus on what constitutes effective school programs, expectations and standards. Further, if a newly adopted program continues to achieve success when tested by schools on a voluntary basis, it is nominated as a potential "urban model" program by the project, thus qualifying for implementation in all appropriate schools. In this way, UEPP-developed programs will gradually form a common foundation of core programs that are consistent throughout the feeder system. The shift of funds from school-

based to project-wide resulted from the use of this model-building process.

The long-term aim of this grass roots model development process is for the schools within one attendance area to consist in large part of proven urban model programs organized in administrative patterns that support continuous improvement. The projected time frame for this gradual transformation of UEPP schools is twelve years, the time it would normally take for a first grader who entered the feeder system when UEPP did to graduate from high school.

UEPP PROGRAMS AND INTERIM RESULTS

Four key premises and several related assumptions about the model-building process have been discussed above. The second part of this paper reports on progress to date for each of the five program areas: student achievement, student motivation, student conduct, staff development, and community involvement. This story of two consecutive years of improvement throughout a previously distressed inner-city school district is notable, but hardly conclusive. These results are considered preliminary, and are advanced here as evidence of the potential of the overall improvement process they stem from. For this reason, an exhaustive analysis of educational outcomes will not be attempted here.[8] Rather, the intention is to establish with preliminary data a case for the potential effectiveness of the UEPP model-building process.

Sample

In 1979-80, the last full year for which data are available, the Hughes attendance area consisted of fifteen schools (one senior high, one junior high, one middle school, ten elementary schools, and two primary schools). Each school eventually sent more than 80% of its pupils to Hughes, the senior high. The district served 8,500 students with more than 375

teachers. This student population was 88% Black, 10% Appalachian, and 2% diverse cultural backgrounds. Most of the students were of poor and working class background.

Student Achievement

Historically, the Hughes attendance area has had the lowest achievement test scores in the Cincinnati area, with approximately 50% of the students scoring below average (stanines 1, 2 and 3) on the nationally normed Metropolitan Achievement Test. Since the project began in 1977, the percentage of students scoring average or above average on the tests has increased for two consecutive years, up 8.1% in mathematics and up 6.8% in reading. Scores increased in ten of sixteen schools for reading and in nine of sixteen schools for mathematics. To improve achievement, UEPP adopted three basic strategies.

First, UEPP provided additional teachers and aides for school principals to use in achievement-boosting programs. School staffs chose a variety of tactics. Three schools created a basic skills laboratory for small group remedial work in reading or mathematics. One school provided an instructional aide to every primary grade level. One school added an extra primary teacher, reducing all primary classses by six students. Two schools began a Test Wiseness program, teaching test-taking skills to all grade levels. Other schools provided specialty teachers for art, music, and physical education to allow increased attention by regular classroom teachers to basic skills development. These were examples of innovative programs specific to single schools. UEPP's next two achievement improvement strategies are examples of school-based model programs that were adopted by all project schools.

Second, UEPP helped create Honor Clubs or Societies to provide special recognition and opportunities for high achievers and good citizens. Honor Club students are recognized each quarter during a ceremony in which their parents pin a ribbon on them. At the same time, the students pass over to their parents a personal letter of appreciation. When the project began, only one school had an Honor Club or Society; now all schools do. As discussed later, the model program was tried first in one school, then transmitted through the UEPP network.

Third, UEPP initiated an Academic League competition, whose purpose was to enhance the academic tone in a school by encouraging academic competition at a classroom and school level. Academic League competitions--intramural academic games in English, Mathematics, Social Studies and Science--also began at one school and this year will be pilot-tested by nearly all UEPP schools. In sum, project schools have created accelerated progress in student achievement through a variety of school-based programs, two of which were adopted by the entire district.

Student Motivation

Student self-attitudes and motivation to learn well, as measured by the perceptions of students, teachers and parents, have been consistently lower in the Hughes area than in the Cincinnati schools as a whole. To increase student motivation, UEPP sponsored three major strategies: the Extended Day program, Field Trips, and a Talent Search.

First, a major effort was made to stimulate the creation of extra-curricular opportunities for students (which were not generally available to a wide extent in urban schools). It began with one school deciding to

keep school open an extra hour each day for extracurricular activities. By the next year, through its Extended Day and Supplemental Contracts programs, UEPP organized more than 150 extracurricular activities in fifteen schools. As discussed in the third section of the paper, this program was initiated in a different way by each school, but depended on supplemental funding from the project.

Second, UEPP provided coordination and funding for 448 field trips and cultural events in 1978-79. These events involved a total of 37,336 student participants. As in the extracurricular program, each school received a field trip budget, which could also be used to bring cultural groups to perform at school assemblies.

Third, the UEPP Talent Search recognized and encouraged emerging talents and special interests of UEPP students. Three hundred and ten talented students were identified by their teachers as having special talents or interests in Academics, Leadership, the Arts, Vocational Skills, or Athletics. Students were officially inducted to the Talent Search program in a parent meeting at each school, then formed into clubs who took field trips related to their talent area. Further, two-thirds of the talented students were matched with "Adopt-A-Student" sponsors, adults working in the child's career interest. Through letters, phone calls, and visits, the sponsors encouraged and supported the development of student talent.

Student motivation programs were started in project schools by a special category of personnel newly hired by UEPP, called the Instructional Leaders. These nine master teachers from the Hughes area were relieved of daily classroom teaching duties to work in one or more schools as

coordinators of UEPP programs. They were the missing link between the Central Office and the schools. By serving on project-wide planning committees, then shaping the program models to fit individual school circumstances, they were the motivators who made the student motivation programs begin to take hold as traditions in UEPP schools.

The cumulative impact of these motivation programs can be incompletely captured through attitude survey data. Student self-attitudes (as measured by annual student surveys) increased by 5% on the elementary level and by 1% on the secondary level from 1977-79. Student positive responses to survey statements related to their motivation to learn well also showed a clear increase (2.4%) for the first time in recent years on the secondary level, while remaining relatively constant at the elementary level. These modest increases were particularly encouraging because they marked the first reverse of a previously declining trend in survey data concerning student attitudes and motivation.

Student Conduct

UEPP focused on the twin student conduct problems of poor attendance and disruptive behavior. Attendance in Hughes area schools averages approximately 5% - 6% less than in all Cincinnati schools. Suspension and expulsion rates are typically among the highest in the city. To work on these problems, UEPP provided each school with a "home-school facilitator", a community resident serving as a liaison between parents and educators. On a daily or weekly basis, the facilitators contacted (by phone or visit) the homes of every absent or tardy student. They worked with parents, teachers and children to set up incentive programs

for improved attendance and behavior. As a result of these activities, attendance in UEPP schools improved last year for four consecutive quarters by an average of 3.6% project-wide, a feat that had not occurred during the previous five years of steady attendance decline. At the same time, suspensions and expulsions in UEPP schools decreased by 11%, during a period in which suspensions increased system-wide by 11%. In sum, an improvement in student conduct has begun to be noted. The improvement can be attributed, at least in part, to a direct increase in the number of personnel hired to cope with the problems. However, despite these promising results, these potential model programs--being so labor-intensive--are precisely the kind of program that is jeapordized by a cut-back in funds.

Staff Development

To stimulate staff development, UEPP organized a widespread program of inservice training related to the priority interests of teachers and administrators. In 1978-79, for example, thirty-four inservice programs involving 826 teachers and principals were conducted for a total cost of less than $30,000. This was during a period in which few inservice opportunities could be offered elsewhere in the system. The workshops focused on curriculum innovations, instructional skills, behavior management, classroom organization, and planning skills. They were considered highly effective by participants, with an average response of 4.54 (on a scale of 1 to 5) given to the six major evaluation questions that were common to all assessment surveys. As with other UEPP programs, these inservice worksnop formats were developed and pilot-tested by a single school staff with UEPP assistance, then made available to other schools by request.

Community Involvement

UEPP's community involvement program reaches out to five target groups: universities, parents, businesses, ministers and alumni. The five Community Involvement programs are coordinated by a member of the management staff, and carried out by a part-time consultant, home-school facilitators, and instructional leaders.

First, UEPP established collaborative relationships with two area universities: Central State University and the University of Cincinnati (UC). The collaboration had five components: college motivation programs, student visitation programs, university student practicum, the adopt-a-student program and shared faculty experiences. As a result of collaboration on these programs, the number of students applying to college has tripled since UEPP began, from 59 in 1977-78 to 205 in 1978-79. The university collaboration program is discussed as a case study in the final section of the paper.

Second, when UEPP began, there were active parent groups in five of seventeen schools. Today, all but three schools have active parent support groups. Third, an Academic Boosters campaign attracted 145 neighborhood businesses and community groups who volunteered services and support to project schools. Fourth, a ministers' support group of 24 area ministers has been formed. Ministers will visit schools and motivate students and parents from their pulpits. Fifth, alumni support groups have been formed at Central State and UC to increase the likelihood of retention and success for these students.

In short, an active community interest in improving the local public schools has been awakened since UEPP began. The challenge of implementing model programs in this area is that they require the coordinated cooperation of project staff, school staffs from various schools, and many individuals and organizations from the community. Yet, UEPP's ultimate goal of a unified school district will not be accomplished until there is organized community interest and support for schools in the district.

To summarize, preliminary results from two years of UEPP operations show that dramatic progress is possible across one inner-city school district. Increased achievement scores, improved student attitudes and motivation, higher attendance, lower suspension and expulsion rates, high involvement in staff development, a tripling in the number of college applicants, the support of parents, ministers, businesses and alumni: these measurable outcomes demonstrate at least the potential of the UEPP model-building process.

As a project, we are just shifting from a mobilization phase to an implementation and refinement phase. At the risk of drawing premature conclusions, it is appropriate to look in more detail at the process by which selected demonstration programs have been started and implemented across the district.

CASE STUDIES IN MODEL BUILDING

The third section of the paper will analyze five examples of the UEPP model building process. The sequence of events leading to the adoption of each model program will first be summarized briefly. Both highly successful and less successful programs will be described. Next, three hypotheses

about implementation will be drawn as tentative conclusions from the case studies. These hypotheses can be used to guide future research and practice. The five case studies to be summarized are: the Council of Principals, the Honor Clubs, the Extended Day program, the Talent Search, and the University Collaboration program.

Council of Principals

In germative form, the idea of a Council of Principals was inherent in the process used to develop the UEPP proposal. For proposal development, each school staff was asked to dream what their school would be like if they had sufficient resources to re-design the total learning environment. Implicit in this process was the idea that each school could build a different program to match its needs, but each school's program would also have to make sense as part of a district-wide effort. The idea of a Council of Principals was proposed by principals during the early planning process as a means to coordinate individual school efforts on a district-wide basis.

Second, a planning committee consisting of principals, management staff and other resource people conceptualized a more precise organization for the Council. Third, a retreat was planned, during which principal committees proposed functions, goals and decision-making procedures for the Council, in response to detailed committee charges set by the planning committee.

Fourth, principals began holding monthly meetings, whose agendas were initially set by the management staff, although principals were encouraged to submit items. Although they were the final decision-makers, the principals and the Council remained primarily in a reactive role at this stage. Over the first year, however, an understanding of the

problems of the district as a whole emerged and the traditional conflicts between my school and your school, or between elementary schools and secondary schools. were slowly subsiding into a more generalized awareness of the total district.

Fifth, in the second project year the principals organized Council committees with clear functions. Still, these committees met, if at all, in response to management staff prodding and agenda. But, at the end of the second year, a turning point was reached. During the budget setting process, principals grew concerned that the management staff had too much control over the allocation of resources to their schools. They recognized, however, that management staff control stemmed from its detailed familiarity with the operation of the project. In short, the principals did not yet have sufficient data to control the project.

So, in the third year of the project, the Council's chairman, who did have detailed knowledge of UEPP, decided to call for elections, so that other principals could participate more broadly in project implementation. At the same time, the Council organized a new committee structure that closely paralled the management staff organization. For example, the principals formed a Budget Committee to work with the management staff budget coordinator. In a similar way, each committee now had one management staff person assigned to it. The principal committees also made monthly progress reports to the whole Council. In fact, a friendly rivalry developed over which principal committee could give the most professional report. By now, the management staff was clearly in a resource role: gathering data, making recommendations, and preparing budget reports for principal revision and action. With a much closer knowledge of project operations district-wide, the principals had

gradually organized their Council in a way that it truly set the policies and made the decisions for the UEPP district. In brief, the development of the Council of Principals followed this sequence:

1) Identification of a need for a coordinating body.
2) Conceptualization of the Council by a planning committee.
3) Approval at a principal's retreat.
4) Initial implementation--control of Council by management staff.
5) Formation of first principal committees.
6) Concern over budget decision-making.
7) Election of new leadership and creation of parallel organization with management staff.
8) Effective committee work and establishment of control by principals.

Honor Clubs

As noted above (page 11), when the project began only one school had an Honor Society or Club. The spread of Honor Clubs throughout UEPP began when a UEPP instructional leader at a junior high school learned about the high school program and decided to institute a National Junior Honor Society at her school. Next, UEPP management staff and instructional leaders decided to create a parallel organization for elementary schools called the UEPP Honor Club. A committee of management staff, instructional leaders and teachers wrote an Honor Clubs proposal and submitted it for the approval of the principals.

Now, in the second year of this program, all schools have an official Honor Club or Society. Currently, the Honor Clubs are implemented by a combination of instructional leaders and school-based teachers, with no extra teacher pay involved. In the schools where the program has been in effect for two years, it is becoming a tradition looked forward to by parents and children. In short, the sequence of implementation steps for Honor Clubs was:

1) Existence of a National Model (the National Senior Honor Society).
2) Implementation of a National Model at the Junior High.
3) Adaptation to elementary level by a committee of principals and school personnel.
4) Approval by principals for initial implementation.
5) Second year adoption by all schools.

Extended Day

When UEPP began, the major extracurricular program available in elementary schools was a drill team in some of the schools. Recognizing the dual importance of academics and extracurriculars, one elementary principal decided to extend the school day by one hour each day, during which time volunteer teachers and students could organize hobby clubs or academic interest groups. Almost all the teachers and about half the students agreed and participated.

Next, the UEPP management staff presented the idea in proposal form to the Council of Principals, who accepted it on the condition that supplemental contracts be offered to teachers, aides or community people for starting and carrying out these extended day activities. The next year, over 150 extracurricular activities were started in UEPP schools, supported by 153 supplemental contracts. In the following year, the supplemental contractual procedures were re-examined at the Central Office. UEPP decided not to encourage the continuation of extracurricular programs or supplemental contracts. As a result, the extended day programs have faded in most schools. The sequence this implementation followed was:

1) Innovation created at one school (voluntary basis).
2) Management staff organizes proposal for dissemination.
3) Principals approve, with supplemental funding provision.
4) Program implemented in all schools on a paid basis.
5) Central office review of funding procedures.
6) Program continued without funding emphasis.
7) Reduction of program.

Talent Search

The idea for the Talent Search originated with the management staff, who recognized a need for a student motivation program that was not strictly limited to academic performance. The program was first conceptualized by the management staff and instructional leaders. They identified talent search areas and sketched out the three follow-up activities of the search: a parent meeting to discuss talent development resources, a field trip enrichment program, and the Adopt-a-Student program. Again, the program was approved by the Council of Principals, who negotiated for a $100 stipend to be paid a coordinating teacher in each school. Their feeling at this point was that too many extra demands were being made on the teachers.

Now, in the program's second year, the incentive funding has been dropped, and so too has the participation level of teachers. The Talent Search, though much better organized, is operated from a central base by management staff and project-wide personnel who contact the sponsors, organize the field trips, and keep track of the talented students. In this approach, much more is happening for students. However, plans are to scale down the scope of the project next year, in an attempt to find a format allowing greater participation by regular staffs of the schools.

In brief, the implementation process was;

1) Identification of a need by central office management staff.
2) Conceptualization by management staff and instructional leaders.
3) Approval by principals with incentive funding.
4) Reorganization, incentive funding, project staff implementation.
5) Reduced focus program.

University Collaboration

The University Collaboration program began with an idea spun off by a speaker brought in to motivate UEPP teachers at a summer institute. The speaker was Dr. Arthur Thomas, Vice-President for Academic Affairs at Central State University; the idea, to have his university "adopt" the Hughes feeder system schools. The UEPP Project Director took the idea as a serious opportunity, and sought and received a resolution from the assembled teachers asking the Council of Principals to make it a reality. A planning committee was formed that summer, consisting of principals, management staff, high school administrators, and university representatives, including the Vice President. Within three meetings, five meanings of adoption were agreed upon (see above, page 14).

As these programs were implemented, and hundreds of university and high school students began their field trips to the college campus or to the high school, a coordinator was hired in Cincinnati. By the summer, when Central State had admitted more than sixty students, the value to the university was evident enough to convince them to hire a coordinator, as well. Now in the second year of the collaboration, the University has a Hughes Committee that meets weekly, and the project has a coordinator and several project resource people assigned to the program. Already, a Hughes Alumni Support group has been formed on the campus, and an ambitious series of workshops and assemblies is scheduled in Cincinnati. As a result, the formation of a more effective implementation team at the high school is now being addressed.[9]

In short, the following sequence was used in building this model program:

1) Identification and confirmation of an innovative idea.
2) Refinement by a representative planning committee.
3) Initial implementation.
4) UEPP re-organization; a coordinator is hired.
5) Organization of an implementation team at the university.
6) Formation of an implementation team at the high school.

Reflections on the Model Building Process

As is evident, UEPP has worked through several trials and errors in identifying its model building processes. This variability makes generalization about the model-building process difficult to sustain. Moreover, two and one-half years of project operations is a very early point at which to assess the dissemination of innovative programs, which are said to require a minimum of six years to implement. Nevertheless, three hypotheses about implementation have been formed from our experience, and are now being examined in practice.

Hypothesis 1. Successful model programs can be built through this general sequence:

1) Recognition of a need by a school-based group.
2) Conceptualization of a program by a committee including management staff, instructional leaders and school personnel.
3) Review and approval by the Council of Principals.
4) Initial implementation with project staff in key implementation roles.
5) Reorganization with broader implementation roles for school staffs, and resource and coordinating roles for project personnel.

At each step in this sequence, alternatives are possible, particularly in terms of who carries out the activity. But, our effective model-building processes have begun with a need that people in the school perceived clearly and felt strongly. As the Extended Day and Talent Search case studies suggest, programs conceptualized and operated from a central office base were more difficult to sustain, even with incentive pay. However, central office management staff could be invaluable as resource people who served on

design and initial implementation committees. Next, the Council of Principals must approve a program as a potential urban model, so that it can be pilot-tested by project personnel in their schools. However, after an initial implementation period, school-based personnel have to re-organize the program to fit into their work schedules and priorities. At this point, the management staff could step back into a coordinating and monitoring role. Extending this sequence, we might expect to reach a point when UEPP instructional leaders could also re-orient their involvement from direct implementation to indirect assistance. At this point, the program would have a momentum of its own in the district, and be on its way to establishment as a model program.

Hypothesis 2. The Council of Principals' decisions can be used to create an organizational climate in each school and across the district that gives UEPP's potential model programs sufficient legitimacy to support their trial and assumption by school staffs.

The principal's unique contribution to implementation lies not in defining "how to do it", for this advice is better offered by project or school staff with the time for broad involvement in implementation. Rather, the principals are gatekeepers of change, who establish the priority level of a program for their busy staffs. The greatest potential of the Council of Principals is as a peer reference group that can motivate the reluctant principal or school staff to participate in concerted district-wide action.

Hypothesis 3. Potential model programs with the highest likelihood of being adopted by school staffs are those that allow fairly broad autonomy to the individual school in the use of district-wide resources to accomplish district-wide goals.

In the Hughes feeder system, principals and school staffs are learning that they must be at least as big as a high school attendance area to

attract the magnitude of resources needed to solve educational problems. At the same time, each school must remain flexible and autonomous enough to design its own way of carrying out programs agreed upon by the Council of Principals. Improvements in urban schools depend on the creativity, responsiveness and unselfishness of the people in those schools. Teachers and principals can be motivated by the control of additional resources and by the possibility of one of their ideas being approved for adoption by the district. Project staff can assist by providing additional personnel, program implementation ideas and the leeway needed to experiment. But overly restrictive controls on funds or procedural decisions made apart from the implementation site serve to channel innovation into narrow paths of influence within a school, and tend to stifle the possibility of long-term adoption of model programs.

Conclusion

To date, UEPP can offer the state legislators several examples of potential model programs. More importantly, however, we are developing a way of thinking about effective demonstration programs that are likely to be implemented in a unified, purposeful fashion in one attendance area. The transformation of urban schools will probably not spread in strict model form from city to city, as originally envisioned by legislators. Instead, the Cincinnati experience teaches that variations of model program concepts will be developed and refined in-house, by school staffs who identify with a coordinated effort to improve conditions for learning across one high school feeder system. This paper has discussed key premises in this way of thinking; summarized interim UEPP programs and results indicative of the potential of this developing perspective; and examined five case studies of model program development to identify three working hypotheses that guide our ongoing work.

REFERENCES

1. See J.J. Schwab, The Practical: A Language for Curriculum (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1970) for a discussion of "theoretic" vs. "practical" activities.

2. When Spiro Agnew remarked, "If you've seen one ghetto, you've seen them all," he was speaking from a theoretic perspective!

3. W.H. Schubert, "Recalibrating Educational Research: Toward a Focus on Practice," Educational Researcher, June 1980, 9, 1, 17-24.

4. P. Berman et. al., Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. 6, The Findings in Review (Santa Monica, CA.: The Rand Corporation, 1975), p. v.

5. Ibid., p. vii.

6. Schwab, op.cit.

7. Two schools from the original seventeen have been closed due to school consolidation.

8. For complete documentation and analysis of UEPP programs, see Ward J. Ghory, UEPP Annual Reports, vol. 1 and 2, unpublished manuscripts available from the Cincinnati Public Schools, 1977-79.

9. For an in-depth analysis of the model-building process for the University Collaboration program, see Kriner Cash, University-Public School Collaboration: An Urban Model for Student Motivation, a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Urban Education Association in Detroit, Michigan, November 1979.